PATENT APPLICATION

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 1762

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Osamu ITATANI et al. Group Art Unit: 1762

Application No.: 10/559,435 Examiner: F. PARKER

Filed: December 5, 2005 Docket No.: 125433

For: METHOD FOR FORMING ADHESIVE LAYER

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the July 6, 2007 Office Action, the period for reply being extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, reconsideration of the rejections in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 are pending in this application. The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1-8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,505,990 to Sagawa et al. (hereinafter "US '990").[1] The Office Action, on page 3, rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over US '990 in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0006733 to Sagawa et al. (hereinafter "US '733"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

---

[1] Applicants note that claim 1 was previously canceled.

Independent claim 2 recites, among other features, putting adhesive layer formation media coated with adhesive materials and at least one workpiece into a container. US '990 cannot reasonably be considered to teach this feature.

The Office Action, on page 2, asserts that US '990 teaches placing in a container one or more substrate articles, impact media, adhesive powder, and a coating powder that may include inorganic particles. Despite these assertions, for the reasons discussed below, US '990 does not teach or suggest that impact media itself, or any other allegedly corresponding adhesive layer formation media put into a container, is coated with adhesive materials.

US '990, at col. 3, lines 57-60, merely teaches placing the substrate article, the adhesive powder, impact media and a coating powder into a container, and thereafter stirring the impact media together with parts, a coating powder and an adhesive powder for forming an adhesive layer on the parts. US '990, at col. 3, lines 57-66, teaches that the impact media strike the parts to push adhesive onto the parts. Clearly, based on this disclosure of US '990, the impact media of US '990 is not "coated with" an adhesive layer as would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, and as used in the context of the pending claims. As such, US '990 cannot reasonably be considered to teach putting an adhesive layer formation media coated with adhesive materials and at least one workpiece into a container.

In US '990, when the impact media and adhesive materials are separately put into a container, the adhesive materials do not necessarily attach onto the workpieces when the impact media collide against the workpieces. That is, all of the impact media that collide against the workpieces do not contribute to the formation of the adhesive layer onto the workpieces, resulting in a small coating efficiency. Particularly, if the amount of adhesive materials is small or their viscosity is high, the adhesive materials are difficult to evenly spread or distribute in the whole container. In US '990, the adhesive materials, when put into the container separately from the impact media, may congregate by themselves. The

congregated adhesive materials may attach onto the workpieces, whereby thin or uniform coating is hampered. The congregated adhesive materials may also trap the impact media inside and decrease their chance of working.

The method recited in claim 2 allows that the adhesive materials evenly adhere to the workpieces each time the formation media collides against the surface of the workpieces due to the adhesive layer formation media coated with adhesive materials. The adhesive materials themselves do not congregate onto the surface of the workpieces, and the adhesive layer formation media are prevented from being trapped in congregated adhesive materials. This enables a uniform adhesive layer to be created on the surface of the workpieces with a high degree of efficiency. Thus, the present subject matter additionally provides unexpected results over the method disclosed in US '990.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, US '990 cannot reasonably be considered to teach all of the features positively recited in independent claim 2. Further, claims 3-8, 10 and 11 are also not taught, by US '990 for at least the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on allowable independent claim 2, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recite. Additionally, claim 9 is also not taught, nor would it have been suggested, by US '990, even in combination with US '733, as US '733 has not been applied in a manner that would remedy the above-identified shortfalls in the application of US '990 to the subject matter of claim 2.

For the totality of the above discussion, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Timothy S. Smith
Registration No. 58,355

JAO:TSS/clf

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 6, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461